

Amendment 14 Responses to Questions

Internal Tracking Number	Question or Comment	Response
569	There is no instruction for Proposal format delivery in the DIs or Amendment 14. Should our revised submission contain the entire proposal as December 8, 2005 proposal - (i.e. 4 separate volume binders for MANAGED SERVICES PROPOSAL – Transition and Technical Requirements, MANAGED SERVICES PROPOSAL – Program Operations, Management and Past Performance, BUSINESS, and PRICING) as well as however many electronic copies (i.e CDs)? OR does TCE want to see changed sections only.	Submissions shall contain the entire proposal (i.e. four separate volumes). The Government requires the numbers of electronic and hardcopy versions as stated in Section L.8 of the RFP. Pages, sections, or volumes that are omitted from the revised proposal may not be considered in the evaluation. See also Questions 570, 571, and 572.
570	Does TCE want separate responses for each DI after the live face-to-face discussion, or should we only incorporate them into our revised proposal?	Revised proposal submissions shall include, as a part of the cover letter and not included in the page limitation, responses to each item listed in the discussion letter and a cross reference to where that item is addressed in the revised proposal. In addition, each and every response must be included in the body of the revised proposal to be considered for evaluation.
571	How would TCE want to see the changes in our revised submission? For example, should we have deleted text shown as strike through, or in a balloon on the side margin or not shown at all? Should additional text and revised language shown in Red Ink?	New or revised text shall be clearly identified by a colored font and/or yellow highlight. Offerors shall include in the cover letter, a listing of all text that has been deleted and a page reference from where the text has been removed.
572	Section L.8 of the original RFP clearly states the number of page limit for Volume 1 & 2. TCE has Prequested, via the DIs that we expand upon previous proposal information. In expanding our proposal, it is natural to expect there will be additional number of pages associated with any change bars and expanded information. Since there is a page limit, we would be forced to delete other previously submitted sections of our proposal - sections for which we may not have received any DIs. This also relates to question 3 above regarding deleted text. If we must use strike through, we will be doubling our page count. Does TCE have any additional guidance for offerors facing this situation? May we be granted additional pages for each volume (I & II) to meet the additional requirements stated in the DIs and Amendment 14?	All revised proposals are subject to the page limitations cited in Section L.8 of the RFP. All deleted text shall be identified in the cover letter with the appropriate page reference from where it was removed.
573	Please confirm that the nine-month transition period from October 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007 is in reference only to the transition plan.	For EVALUATION PURPOSES only and to complete their proposed transition plan, the Offerors shall assume the transition will begin on October 1, 2006 and end no later than June 30, 2007, which would be a nine-month transition period.
574	For Category 1 sites in B-4 MDO, do the specified Transport and Local Loop sizes represent the total bandwidth required for dual facilities or only the primary capacity?	The capacity listed for every site is the minimum capacity that shall be bid. For any site, if a back up solution is proposed in order to meet the availability or other performance considerations, then the proposal should clearly state that this back up is included, and the capacity and pricing for it should be included in the CLINs proposed. For example, if a primary and back up local loop are needed to meet the availability, both the primary and backup should be included in the single monthly price for that site at that bandwidth level. Also, both the primary loop and the backup loop when considered separately should have sufficient bandwidth to support the minimum needs of the site as stated in the MDO in case either the primary or back up is rendered inoperable. If primary and backup transport are needed, then both should be included in the single transport CLIN price for that category of site and bandwidth level. Both the primary and the backup transport when considered separately should be sufficient to meet the minimum needs of the site as stated in the MDO.

Amendment 14 Responses to Questions

Internal Tracking Number	Question or Comment	Response
575	For Attachment L-7 Summary Price, should Year 1 totals include 12 months of cost for Enterprise Directory Services and Link Encryption?	Per Section L.10.4, Tab D, Year 1 total price shall be determined "by multiplying the monthly prices Offerors input on Attachment B-1 by 9 months for the first year".
576	Will the Government please provide more detail regarding its request for a "local loop legend?" Does this mean a mapping from the B-4 MDO to the B-2 and B-3 Loop Price Tables? Also, when there is a disparity between B-4 MDO and the B-2 and B-3 Loop Price Tables, which schedule prevails? Specifically, the MDO requires 3-T1, 5 - T1, 6 - T1, and 7 - T1 local loop sizes while the tabs on Tables B-2 and B-3 indicate DS3 for all bandwidth requirements greater than 4 - T1 and less than OC3.	Per Amendment 15, Section L.10.4, please confirm that you are using standard industry terminology for circuit sizes in completing your proposal. Offerors shall confirm its understanding that a T1 is a 1.544 Mbps circuit; a DS3 is a 45 Mbps circuit; an OC3 is a 155 Mbps circuit; an OC12 is a 622 Mbps circuit; an OC48 is a 2.4 Gbps circuit; an OC192 is 10 Gbps circuit. Regarding the disparity between the B-4 table versus B-2 and B-3, the Government would like the vendors to price circuits using the B-2 and B-3 tables. Therefore, any bandwidth requirements greater than 4-T1s and less than an OC3 should utilize a DS3 circuit.
577	Two sites appear in the MDO that are not currently listed in the B Tables. Will the Government add the following addresses to the B2 Table? - 12600 W Colfax Ave, Lakewood, CO (GDE001) - 2246 Lee Hwy, Bristol, VA (BRI003)	BRI003 and GDE001 were added to the B2 table as the sites were listed on the MDO but not on the B2 Table.
578	The Enhancement codes appear to be incorrect for Year 7 in the MDO. For example, for facility code ADV001, the Enhancements code is "X011 AD, AE, AF" in year 6, but in year 7, it shows the code to be "X0111". This is consistent for all locations with Enhancement codes in year 7. No other years seem to have been effected.	Related to question # 591. The Government modified the enhancement columns in years 4 and 7.
579	There are two sites that appear to have contradicting Category CLINs versus their labeled Site Categories. Please clarify the following sites: - FRS024 is labeled as Site Category 1 but has Category 2 CLINs (Enhancement CLIN X027 BD, BE, BF) - ATL052 is labeled as Site Category 2 but has Category 3 CLINs (Enhancement CLIN X042 CD, CE, CF)	<b>FRS024</b> - the government replaced category 2 CoS-2 and CoS-3 Transport CLINS for years 1 - 10 with the correct category 1 CLINS. There is no CoS-1 transport bandwidth at this facility. This location was not on the enhancements list so no changes or additions were made to enhancement CLINS at this facility. <b>ATL052</b> - the government replaced category 3 CoS-2 and CoS-3 Transport CLINS for years 1 - 10 with the correct category 2 CLINS. The Government also modified the enhancement CLINS to reflect that it is a category 2 site.
580	The two addresses provided below appear in Tables B2 and B4. While the addresses appear to be to the same location, the addresses do differ in some respects. To ensure that these are indeed the same locations, will the Government correct the entries so that the addresses in B2 and B4 are identical? - Cat 2 Ft. Knox, KY (B2); E Bullion Blvd (B4) - Cat 2 West Point, NY (B2); Route 218 (B4)	The addresses for FKX001 and WST002 were changed to match those found on the MDO.
581	The Government provided two entries for Bryan, Texas under site BRY001. In the MDO tables, BRY001 has a valid NPA/NXX of 979/260. In attachment B3 it has a non-valid NPA/NXX as 409/260. Can the Government provide the valid NPA/NXX for this Bryan, Texas Location?	B3 tables contain many additional values that are not featured in the MDO, and the entries in the B3 tables are not necessarily tied to any particular facility code in the MDO. No changes will be made.
582	The following Category 2 sites from the MDO do not have matching CLINs in the B2 tables. Can the Government provide the missing CLINs? - BRI003 (2426 Lee Hwy) - GDE001 (12600 Colfax Ave) - GLN010 (1131 Chappel Crossing Rd; Building 262; FLETC) - PIT001 (1000 Liberty Ave)	GLN010(line124) and PIT001 (line 65) are already included in B2. The Government will add GDE001 and BRI003 to the B2 tables.

Amendment 14 Responses to Questions

Internal Tracking Number	Question or Comment	Response
583	<p>The following two address do not match between the B2 tables, and the MDO. Can the Government provide the correct site addresses?</p> <p><b>MDO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FKX001 (E. Bullion Blvd)</li> <li>- WST002 (Route 218)</li> </ul> <p><b>B2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FKX001 (Ft. Knox)</li> <li>- WST003 (West Point)</li> </ul>	<p>Related to question # 580. The street address <b>is</b> different in both instances, but the NPA/NXX, City and State are identical. The Government will modify the addresses in B2 tables to match the MDO.</p>
584	<p>There is not a matching CLIN from attachment B3 for the following category 3 sites included in the MDO. Can the Government provide the missing CLINs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BVE001 (8108 Odell Rd)</li> <li>- BVE004 (6900 Muirkirk Meadows Dr)</li> <li>- HMA001 (423 Lafayette St)</li> <li>- HML003 (1200 Negron Dr)</li> <li>- LRL001 (9200 Powder Mill Rd)</li> <li>- MNC001 (211 N. Delaware Ave)</li> <li>- NYC055 (South &amp; Montgomery St; Office of Emergency Management)</li> </ul>	<p>The Gernment will add the following entries and NPA NXX values to B3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BVE001 (8108 Odell Rd) 301/385</li> <li>- BVE004 (6900 Muirkirk Meadows Dr) 301/385</li> <li>- HMA001 (423 Lafayette St) 385/868</li> <li>- HML001 - (1200 Negron Dr) 609/584</li> <li>- LRL001 (9200 Powder Mill Rd) 301/490</li> <li>- MNC001 (211 N. Delaware Ave) 641/851</li> <li>- NYC055 (South &amp; Montgomery St; Office of Emergency Management) 718/422</li> </ul>
585	<p>In the MDO there are some locations where the site category value does not match the category of the CLINs provided for the site. Which value takes precedence when there is a conflict - the "site category" column or the columns for "CoS-1 CLIN", "CoS-2 CLIN" or "CoS-3 CLIN"?</p>	<p>Related to question # 579. The government modified the CLINs prepopulated in the MDO for ATL052 and FRS024 to ensure that the category reflected on the MDO is consistent with the CLINS that are populated on the MDO.</p>
586	<p>The MDO, attachment B3, includes several sites with local loop sizes equal to 3-T-1s, 5-T-1s, 6-T-1s, 7-T-1s, 2-DS3s, and 2-OC3s, however, there are no supporting CLINs. Can the Government provide new CLINs for these local loop sizes, or do they want the offeror to multiply the existing CLIN by the number of T-1s and footnote the pricing tables and MDO?</p>	<p>Related to question # 576. The CLINS listed in the B2 and B3 tables are correct. The government will update the MDO to correspond with the CLINS listed in the B2 and B3 tables. 151 cells formerly containing "5-T1," 64 cells formerly containing "6-T1," and 61 cells formerly containing "7-T1" on each of the MDO tabs have been replaced with "1-T3." There will not be any loop size requirements for 5xT1, 6xT-1 or 7xT1, and all loop size values between 9M and 45M now reflect 1-T3. Further, instances of 2-T3's have been changed to OC3, and instances of 2-OC3's have been changed to OC12.</p>
587	<p>Referencing attachment B4, would the Government please clarify the discrepancy in units between the Transport Size values shown populated in the tables (b/s) and the header (Mb/s)?</p>	<p>Changed the Transport size (Mbps) to Transport Size (bps) and carried this change out for all 10 years on both the MDO template with prices and the MDO template with no prices.</p>
588	<p>In the revised MDO, the following four sites listed have zero transport bandwidth but Treasury shows a local loop and enhancements being ordered and the CLINs are empty - please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DBL001</li> <li>- HRR003</li> <li>- MEM020</li> <li>- WAC003</li> </ul>	<p>Loop and enhancement CLIN values for facilities with zero bandwidth minimums have been removed.</p>
589	<p>The Government is asking vendors for a 'local loop legend' for the proposed loop sizes. Could the Government provide a more detailed description of this requirement? Our MDO submission included a column with the access loop sizes for each location. In Amendment 14 the Government has populated that column with the required local loop sizes. Given that this local loop size information already exists in the MDO, what additional detail is the Government looking for?</p>	<p>The B2 and B3 tables and the MDO all specify loop sizes in multiples of T1, DS3, etc. Also, the tables provide a parenthetical that indicates what the bandwidth is for this loop combination (bps). However, the B-2 and B-3 tables all specify local loop sizes. See also Question 576 and Section L.10.4 in Amendment 15.</p>

Amendment 14 Responses to Questions

Internal Tracking Number	Question or Comment	Response
590	What is the timing of the government's closing of TCE discussions and will offerors receive written confirmation of such closure?	Treasury intends to close discussions with Offerors when revised proposals are submitted in May 2006. However, Treasury reserves the right to continue discussions with one or more Offerors, if necessary and in the best interest of the Treasury,
591	In the MDO files, both with pricing and without pricing, there appears to be errors in the Enhancement columns for Years 4 and 7. In Year 4, there are Enhancement SCIDs shown for every location and for Year 7, the SCIDs are not valid. Can you please clarify and provide new MDO files as appropriate?	Reference question # 578. The Government has modified the enhancement columns in years 4 and 7.
592	The Amendment 14 SF30 identifies 3 files as having been modified, B2, B3, and B4, however, all of the dates associated with all of the files posted on FedTeds have been changed. Have the other files been changed, and therefore need to be addressed as part of our response to Amendment 14, or is this an anomaly peculiar to FedTeds, and we need only to submit B2, B3, and B4?	The files had to be reposted to the FedTeds website, however, only those cited in the SF30 form have actually been modified or removed.
593	Does the Government want all bidders to provide updates to just their December, 2005 proposal submissions or do all changes from the original July, 2004 proposal submission on forward need to be highlighted?	Offerors shall highlight, or otherwise identify in the body of the proposal, only changes from the December, 2005 proposal. See also Questions 569 to 572.
594	In what format should the bidders' proposal responses to Amendment 0014 be submitted? Hard copy and CDs? Quantity of each format?	Reference Questions 569 to 572. Offerors shall provide the number of copies in the media specified in Section L.8 of the RFP.
595	Can the Government provide a complete list of variations in NPA/NXX between the MDO and loop pricing tables?	Vendors should follow the directions in section L regarding precedence of NPA-NXX values in the MDO versus addresses for Cat 3 sites, and addresses versus NPA-NXX values for Cat 1 and Cat 2 sites. Vendors should also note that in cases where vendors analyses would indicate a different NPA-NXX values for a Cat 3 site than that shown in the MDO, the vendors should bid to the Government provided NPA-NXX values, as directed in Section L.